



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 68151

**Title:** Evaluating the efficacy of endoscopic sphincterotomy on biliary-type sphincter of Oddi dysfunction: A retrospective clinical trial

**Reviewer's code:** 05226098

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Director

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-13 23:34

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-14 10:14

**Review time:** 10 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a very interesting paper. However, it is very difficult to accurately diagnose SOD with FGID. This paper shows the therapeutic effect of EST alone on SOD, but there is no result showing the effect of post-EST drug therapy according to the type of SOD. Please provide detailed data on this point.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 68151

**Title:** Evaluating the efficacy of endoscopic sphincterotomy on biliary-type sphincter of Oddi dysfunction: A retrospective clinical trial

**Reviewer's code:** 05194798

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Director

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-14 11:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-16 08:29

**Review time:** 1 Day and 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This manuscript is an original article which retrospectively assessed the effect of EST as a treatment for biliary-type sphincter of Oddi dysfunction (SOD), as well as the relationship between the comorbidity of functional gastrointestinal disorder (FGID) and treatment success. The authors showed EST was a safe, effective treatment for SOD without FGID, however, additional medical treatment was required in patients with both SOD and FGID. This topic will likely be of interest to clinicians in the field. However, I have serious concerns with this manuscript as shown below: 1. The authors should describe the introduction based on references. 2. The introduction and discussion are somewhat redundant. 3. There are too many tables. Please delete and simplify some of them. 4. Please describe the strength and limitation in this study. 5. The authors should describe when drainage tubes were retrieved as this might influence the outcomes. 6. Please reconsider the title. It sounds strange, and please correct the abbreviations. 7. The description of equipment and consumables was incomplete.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 68151

**Title:** Evaluating the efficacy of endoscopic sphincterotomy on biliary-type sphincter of Oddi dysfunction: A retrospective clinical trial

**Reviewer's code:** 05226098

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Director

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Li Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-29 13:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-30 11:14

**Review time:** 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

It was shown that EST has little effect on improving pain in SOD patients with FGID.  
Therefore, please state that EST should be avoided for these patients.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 68151

**Title:** Evaluating the efficacy of endoscopic sphincterotomy on biliary-type sphincter of Oddi dysfunction: A retrospective clinical trial

**Reviewer's code:** 05194798

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Director

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Li Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-29 22:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-01 13:46

**Review time:** 2 Days and 15 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

The revised manuscript is improved. However, the following minor issues require clarification: 1. (Title) “A retrospective clinical trial” sounds strange. I think “a retrospective clinical study” is common because it’s not a trial. 2. (Equipment and consumables) Please provide the size of ERBD, ENBD, ERPD stent. 3. (Equipment and consumables) What was a balloon dilatation catheter used for? 4. (Statistical analysis) Please provide the name of statistical analysis software. 5. (Discussion) The discussion regarding type III SOD sounds abrupt and misleading as the patients with type III SOD was not included in this study. I recommend the authors describe this in the introduction section. 6. (P11L26-28) This description was overlapped with the result. Please summarize this. 7. The authors should discuss the limitation in more detail.